

Appl. No. 09/940,743
Amdt. dated August 28, 2003
Reply to Office action of June 3, 2003

REMARKS

Applicants thank the examiner for the careful examination given to the present application. The application has been reviewed in light of the Office action and amended as necessary. It is respectfully submitted that the application is patentable over the art of record. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the allowability of claims 3-8. Claims 3 and 5 have been placed in independent form.

The Title and the Abstract have been amended herein in accordance with the examiner's suggestions.

Claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 have also been amended herein in accordance with the examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 2 and the rejection to claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112 are requested.

Figure 14 has been amended herein to add the phrase "PRIOR ART" as shown on the enclosed copy.

Claims 1, 2, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of JP Patent No. 04-64283 to Tokio, et al. For the following reasons, the examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

As conceded by the examiner, the APA does not disclose mounting the sucked parts on a board wherein the suction nozzles are classified into groups according to a shift amount of the suction nozzles in each group, a first group including the suction nozzles having a shift amount within an allowable range for simultaneous suction, and a second group including the suction nozzles having a shift amount outside the allowable range for simultaneous suction, as required by independent claim 1. Thus, the examiner relies on Tokio, et al. to make up for

Appl. No. 09/940,743
Amdt. dated August 28, 2003
Reply to Office action of June 3, 2003

the deficiencies of the APA. However, Tokio, et al. merely discloses two mounting heads having independent drive motors employed to pick up two components and position the two components on a printed board. Tokio, et al. does not describe classifying suction nozzles into groups based on whether they fall within or outside an allowable range for simultaneous suction. In fact, because each suction nozzle is operated independently by a corresponding drive motor in Tokio, et al., there would be no reason to classify a plurality of suction nozzles into groups.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of JP Patent No. 04-64283 to Tokio, et al. and further in view of Tsubouchi, et al. (US 5,911,456). Claims 9 and 11 depend from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable over the APA and Tokio, et al. for at least the reasons cited above. Tsubouchi, et al. does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of the APA and Tokio, et al. Accordingly, the combination of the APA, Tokio, et al., and Tsubouchi, et al. does not make obvious claims 9 and 11.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest every limitation as set forth in the subject claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections based upon the references is respectfully requested.

If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the application.

Appl. No. 09/940,743
Amdt. dated August 28, 2003
Reply to Office action of June 3, 2003

It there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33906.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Una L. Schumacher, Reg. No. 48998

526 Superior Avenue, East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484

Date: August 28, 2003